



Gall, M. R. Y. (2017). Technology in Music Education in England and Across Europe. In S. A. Ruthmann, & R. Mantie (Eds.), *The Oxford Handbook of Technology and Music Education* Oxford University Press. <https://doi.org/10.1093/oxfordhb/9780199372133.013.2>

Peer reviewed version

Link to published version (if available):  
[10.1093/oxfordhb/9780199372133.013.2](https://doi.org/10.1093/oxfordhb/9780199372133.013.2)

[Link to publication record in Explore Bristol Research](#)  
PDF-document

This is the author accepted manuscript (AAM). The final published version (version of record) is available online via Oxford University Press at <https://www.oxfordhandbooks.com/view/10.1093/oxfordhb/9780199372133.001.0001/oxfordhb-9780199372133-e-2?rskey=YR10IZ&result=1> . Please refer to any applicable terms of use of the publisher.

## University of Bristol - Explore Bristol Research

### General rights

This document is made available in accordance with publisher policies. Please cite only the published version using the reference above. Full terms of use are available:  
<http://www.bristol.ac.uk/red/research-policy/pure/user-guides/ebr-terms/>

In this chapter, adopting an autobiographical perspective, I reflect upon the use of music technology within English school classrooms during the last 50 years. ~~The chapter~~ illustrates that this has become so important—particularly for creative work—that formal music technology examination syllabi for older students now exist alongside courses ~~which~~ that focus on “traditional” music skills. ~~The chapter~~ also discusses the less positive position of information communications technology within the music curricula for primary school children and secondary students aged 11–14, and offers thoughts on the future of music technology within the English education system. As a backdrop to the discussion ~~the chapter~~ presents a short reflection on music technological developments in society during the ~~20th~~ twentieth and ~~21st~~ twenty-first centuries. The chapter also includes the perspectives of music educators from a wide range of European countries, during the period 2008–2011, on the position of music technology within their own educational contexts.

music technology; information communications technology; English secondary schools; primary schools; school classrooms; European perspectives; sequencing; recording; Ofsted; GCSE examination.

## Chapter 02

# Technology in ~~Music and~~ Music Education in England and across Europe

Marina Gall

I almost think that in the new great music, machines will also be necessary and will be assigned a share in it. Perhaps industry, too, will bring forth her share in the artistic ascent.

(Busoni, cited by ~~in~~ H. Russcol, *The Liberation of Sound* (1972), p.33).

## Introduction

Amplifier, Apple Lossless Audio Codec (~~ALAC~~), compact disc (CD), CD-ROM, commercial music streaming service, crossover, deck, driver unit, drum machine, DVD-audio effects unit, electric guitar, electric keyboard, equalizer, file-sharing service, FX box, genres: (~~Balkan beat~~, ~~dancehall~~, ~~drum & bass~~, ~~dubstep~~, ~~dub regga~~, ~~garage~~, ~~jungle~~, ~~ragga~~, ~~techno~~, ~~trip-hop~~, ~~two-step~~), headphones, Internet, intranet, iPad, iPhone, iPod, loudspeaker, media player, microphone, MIDI (Musical Instrument Digital Interface), mini-disk recorder, mixer, mp3, multi-track tape recorder, music video games, online audio distribution platform—(~~NuMuU~~), online social networking and microblogging service, open-source file-sharing application, portable audio and video cassette players; pre-amp, sampler, sequencer, social networking website with an emphasis on music—(MySpace), sound processor, speaker, super audio CD (SACD); synthesizer, tape recorder, turntable, video-sharing website, Web 2.0, website, World Wide Web, **!**

Formatted: Font: 12 pt, Highlight

The above list of instruments, devices, and systems illustrates advancements in music and associated technologies over the last half century through which I have lived as a child, a secondary school teacher, a teacher educator, and a researcher of music technology in education. In this chapter, adopting an autobiographical perspective, I will reflect upon music and technology within English school classrooms during the last 50 years. This will include reference to summative governmental reports on school music, which, in England, derive from regular school inspections ~~named by the Office for Standards in Education~~ Ofsted.<sup>2</sup> I will also draw upon two of my own recent publications (Gall, Sammer, & de Vugt, 2012; Sammer, Gall, & Breeze, et al., 2009; Gall et al., 2012), created in collaboration with educators in other European countries, to present a brief picture of the use of music and information and communication technology (ICT) in schools across Europe. The chapter ends with a discussion of key factors that inhibit the effective use of music technology in formal education in my own country. Throughout the sections about England it will become evident that, despite the government's constant acknowledgement of the importance of music technology within classroom work (Office for Standards in Education ~~Ofsted~~, 2004a, 2013), education policies and/or lack of support from school head teachers have meant that ~~it is that the~~ potential of music to enhance and transform learning has not been realized, particularly in music lessons for students aged 5–14. The section that follows provides a backdrop to my personal reflections.

## Technology, Music, and Society

From the very earliest days of human existence, men and women have made use of and crafted instruments to support daily life and music-making (Sachs, 2006); “technical” modifications to instruments—to keyboards between the ~~14th-fourteenth~~ and ~~19th~~

Formatted: Font: 12 pt, Highlight

nineteenth centuries, for example—have enabled new forms of musical expression (Dolge, 1972). As such, one might posit that there have always been technological developments in music, and that all music instruments are technologies. However, during the period from the 1920s to the 1960s the term “music technology,” as associated with musical instruments, referred to those that were electronically powered. Examples in the popular music domain included electric keyboards, the electric guitar, and the drum machine, all of which strongly impacted ~~strongly on~~ contemporary styles and practices of the time (Majeski, 1990, McSwain, 1995; Schrader, 1982). During this time, music developments went beyond the creation of electronic forms of conventional musical instruments. In both classical and popular spheres, new sound-making technologies, such as the synthesizer, used extensively in the pop world, and the theremin and martenot, exploited within the works of experimental classical composers such as Varese (Risset, 2004), enabled new creative possibilities; as well as composing with new electronic sounds, musicians could actually generate new sounds themselves.

Since the early ~~20th~~ twentieth century, the term “music technology” has also related to devices used within the recording industry (Bloustein, Peters, & Luckman et al., 2008). In this sphere, a music technology is something that ~~not only~~ enables sounds not only to be generated; but also to be manipulated in all manner of ways, and to be stored and distributed easily, thus impacting ~~on~~ the musical processes of composition, performance, and listening (~~Theberge, 1997~~ Katz, 2004; ~~Theberge, 1997~~ Katz, 2004). Indeed, in the late ~~20th~~ twentieth century new musical genres such as techno, house, and jungle emerged that are completely reliant on technology for their realization (Richard & Kruger, 2005); as such, in some cases, the technology is the music.

Ever since the advent of the radio (Juniper, 2004) and music within films (Dickinson, 2003), music has been associated with other media (Cook, 1998). However, the binding together of popular music and visuals was particularly significant in the 1980s, as this led to the creation of a new distinctive cultural (technological) art form: the music video (Kaplan, 1987; Mundy, 1999). Though not specifically classified as music technologies, other new developments are very much associated with music; for example, sound is an important aspect of all video games (Zehnder & Lipscomb, 2006) as well as the focus of some (J. Smith, 2004; Tobias, 2012). The Internet has also given rise to significant changes in music and society over the last half century: ease of access to a wide range of music, including the facilities for downloading of music and file sharing (Werner, 2009) for use on portable personal technological listening devices (Lenhart, Purcell, Smith, & Zickuhr et al., 2010); the availability of free composing and recording software, enabling one person to be composer, producer, and marketer (Théberge, 1997); new ways to learn musical/instrumental skills (Baxter, 2013); and new means of exhibiting one's own music, communicating ideas about music, and presenting one's own personal (musical) image within interactive music websites and social networking systems (Raacke & Bonds-Raacke, 2008; Cayari, 2011; Raacke & Bonds-Raacke, 2008; Cayari, 2011). Within these new cultural and social practices, many people's experiences of music are within multimedia settings (Pfeil, Arjan, & Zaphiris et al., 2008), and often involve considerable collaborative activity (Salavuo, 2006).

## Music Technology in English Schools, 1960–1999

So how have such technological tools, and new practices mediated by technology, impacted upon young people and upon music classrooms? I was born in England in 1960;

My earliest contact with music technology was undoubtedly unconscious: my parents owned a radiogram~~me~~ and, like many adults of the time (Cook, 2010), this formed an important part of our daily home life. My first conscious experiences of music technology were of my mother playing Jim Reeves on 78 rpm vinyl records, and of listening excitedly to the Beatles on the ~~45-45~~-inch single bought by my elder brother.

Formatted: Font: 12 pt, Highlight

At primary school, I was lucky to have a specialist music teacher who engaged me in a variety of mainly practical music activities, such as singing accompanied by percussion and recorder playing. At the time, technology was important in this school phase since the British Broadcasting Company's Schools Music Department, set up in the 1940s, ~~scheduled~~ broadcast the radio program, *Music and Movement*, twice weekly (Cox, 1996). Through this, schools lacking a specialist teacher or wanting to enhance their arts curriculum were able to offer dance and drama exercises to music.

Formatted: Font: 12 pt, Highlight

At secondary school, technology supported one of the two main aspects of my classroom music diet: appreciating ~~the~~-classical music (played on vinyl). Technology was also a means by which teachers decided on students' musical aptitude. The Bentley Test (Bentley, 1969), then only available on vinyl, required students to carry out such exercises as determining how many notes were playing in a chord, and which of a number of "bleepy" noises was the highest. At the time, there was disquiet about judgments being made concerning students' musical potential based on one set of tests, for a number of reasons, including the fact that, over time, these ~~analogue~~ analog sources become warped and distorted slightly, thereby placing a question mark over the results (Sergeant & Boyle, 1980). Having gained high marks in these tests, I was offered what

Formatted: Font: 12 pt, Highlight

was then quite common: the opportunity ~~of to~~ borrowing a (non-electronic) musical instrument and of ~~having have~~ weekly lessons, all free of charge (Vulliamy, 1976).

As a teenager, although I was highly involved in classical music through instrumental lessons, ~~like most young people~~ “pop” music was at the center of my life and of my being, ~~as it is for most young people~~. However, in the 1970s, there were almost no opportunities for any engagement with the technology of the time (keyboards, lead and bass guitars), neither in the classroom nor ~~within~~ school extra-curricular instrumental lessons, despite the fact that these “pop” instruments were most desired by many teenagers (Vulliamy, 1976). This was largely because of the strong emphasis that was then placed upon European classical music and because of the knowledge-based, as opposed to practical, skills focus of school leaving examinations of the time (Spruce, 2002). Thus, like so many of my friends, it was only outside ~~of~~ school that I had opportunities to engage with pop music. Luckily, by this time transistor radios were available and cheap (Christenson, ~~DeBenedittis, & Lindlofet al.~~, 1985), and so again, like many other teenagers, I was able to take control of what I listened to, and when and where this took place (~~Larson et al., 1989~~ Fitzgerald Joseph, Hayes, & O’Regan et al., 1995; Larson, Kubey, & Colletti et al., 1989 -Fitzgerald et al., 1995). As a consequence, I spent a huge amount of time engrossed in the latest pop music, including late at night when Radio Luxembourg broadcast their “Top 40” charts. My keen interest in the performing arts also led to my membership ~~of in~~ the “sound team” for school productions, ~~in for~~ which I created backing music on a reel-to-reel tape recorder, editing by cutting and splicing tape with a razor blade.



A personal dual musical identity continued throughout my years as a university music undergraduate. Owing to the almost near non-existence of joint arts courses, or courses these with a focus upon anything other than classical music, my three-three-year undergraduate course was almost exclusively focused upon “traditional” music skills, such as aural, harmony and keyboard harmony. ; in the evenings I pogoed to punk music. It was only as a trainee teacher, in 1981, when I had the good fortune to be allocated as my personal tutor George Odam ~~as my personal tutor~~—a dynamic music educator, who was strongly committed to practical classroom music, including pop and, later, technology (Odam, 2000)—that I was actively encouraged to consider the importance of contemporary popular music and students’ musical preferences in relation to formal music education. As a newly qualified teacher in a tough, multi-cultural, inner-city London school, offering the often disaffected students opportunities to perform popular music in the classroom was hugely motivating. However, practical problems associated with electronic instruments, such as lack of space and good soundproofing, mitigated against their use with anything other than my smaller examination classes. Nevertheless, in the mid-1980s, technology enabled me to make a significant music curriculum change. At this time, teachers in all subjects were permitted to develop their own alternative examination syllabi, ; aimed at lower-attaining students (Tattersall, 1994), and so I joined with a number of other local teachers in offering my 14- to 16-16-year-year-old students a course in which they created and recorded a pop music radio program (on cassette tape) as part of their examination work.

More significant curriculum changes, which directly and indirectly impacted ~~upon~~ the use of music technology in secondary schools, came about in 1986 and 1992 with the

Formatted: Font: 12 pt, Highlight

Formatted: Font: 12 pt, Highlight

publication of the new (GCSE) examination syllabus for all 14-~~to 16-16-year-year~~-olds (Philpott & Carden-Price, 2001) and the introduction of the orders for the first ever music National Curriculum for England and Wales (Department of Education and Science~~DES~~, 1991). Within both, there was a new emphasis on “music for all”; practical music, including composition (which was rare in some schools to this point), and breadth of style and genre within studies, such that world music, jazz, and pop then became commonplace within the curriculum.<sup>8</sup> I welcomed this, heartily; although there was a broad framework within which to work, with no detailed government prescription of content we teachers were free to design lessons of our choice.<sup>9</sup> Despite the growing availability of commercial classroom materials, many teachers created their own units of work and resources; in my case I included projects specifically designed with input from the students themselves, often related to popular music, and including “free” composition.

Formatted: Font: 12 pt, Highlight

Formatted: Font: 12 pt, Highlight

By the 1990s, music keyboards were ubiquitous within English secondary music classrooms and were the main instrument used for group composition and performance work, regardless of the style or genre (Wright, 2002).<sup>10</sup> Indeed, at the turn of the century the government inspectorate expressed concern that staff teaching 11-~~to 14-14-year-year~~-old students “overemphasized the use of keyboards to the exclusion of acoustic or vocal resources” (Office for Standards in Education~~Ofsted~~, 2004b, p. 11), yet this was at a time when the revised National Curriculum for Music had included a new requirement for students to use “ICT to create, manipulate and refine sounds” (Department for Education and Employment/Qualifications and Curriculum Authority~~DfEE/QCA~~, -1999, p. 30).

Formatted: Font: 12 pt, Highlight

I first saw a school computer being used for musical purposes in 1989. At an interview for my third secondary school job I was shown around the music department. Opening the door of a tiny music cupboard mainly used for storage of books, I came upon one ~~17-17-year-year~~-old music student—whom I was later to teach—squeezed in at a small desk using Cubase to compose on an Atari. Since the 1980s, the Edexcel Board had permitted students to create compositions using computer or other technologies, most typically electronic keyboards and stand-alone multi-track tape recorders.<sup>11</sup> In 1995, it offered a completely new Advanced level examination (for 17- ~~to 18-18-year-year~~-olds) ~~entitled~~ Music Technology. The first syllabus included a number of “traditional” elements but, nevertheless, gave ~~the opportunity for~~ students the opportunity to focus their work on technological aspects of music, making related to sequencing and recording (Carden-Price, Philpott, & Lewis et al., 2002).<sup>12</sup> Despite this major curriculum change and the gradual development of a wide range of university undergraduate degree courses in Britain related to music technology,<sup>13</sup> teachers were slow to incorporate technology in classroom music lessons. This was unsurprising since, like most music teachers, I experienced the complete lack of availability of subject-specific training in music (Office for Standards in Education ~~Ofsted~~, 2004a), even though large funds had been designated for in-service teacher development of technological skills between 1999 and 2002 (Leask, 2002). Furthermore, lack of computer hardware and software was characteristic of most music departments throughout the 1990s (Office for Standards in Education ~~Ofsted~~, 2004a) despite the massive investment in computers in secondary schools at that time.<sup>14</sup> This meant that, for many years, most schools had insufficient equipment to work with for a whole class of 11- ~~to 14-14-year-year~~-olds that often numbered up to 30 (Office for

Formatted: Font: 12 pt, Highlight

Formatted: Font: 12 pt, Highlight

Formatted: Font: 12 pt, Highlight

Formatted: Font: 12 pt, Highlight

Standards in EducationOfsted, 2004a). Those school that ~~did~~ did have sufficient equipment were hampered by the absence of music-specific technical help (Office for Standards in Education, 2004a~~ibid.~~).

## Music and Information Communications Technology ~~ICT~~ in English Schools 2000—2013

So what changes have taken place in the ~~fifteen~~ 15 years since I left secondary school teaching and became involved in teacher education? Little in terms of technology and music for children aged ~~5-10~~ five to ten. In primary schools, most teachers are generalists and teach all of the curriculum subjects. As such, they often lack music expertise and confidence in the subject, partly owing to the limited teacher training time typically allocated to music (Hennessy, 2012). These factors, together with the constant emphasis on literacy and numeracy in the primary school, have resulted in reduced time allocations for music within the curriculum (Office for Standards in EducationOfsted, 2013). As such, particularly since 2007, when new governmental financial support for singing and for learning acoustic instruments in the classroom was allotted to primary schools (J. Evans, 2009a), less of a focus has been placed upon music technology, especially for creating music; this is despite the long-standing (outgoing) National Curriculum requirement that pupils should use ICT to “capture, change and to combine sounds” (Department for Education and Employment/Qualifications and Curriculum AuthorityDfEE/QCA, 1999, p. 2/5d). It is difficult not to be muddled by governmental policy when one reads its inspectors’ criticism that between 2008 and 2011 “the use of music technology was inadequate or non-existent in three fifths of primary schools” (Office for Standards in EducationOfsted, 2012, p. 6) and then notes that the

requirements for technology within the primary curriculum ~~were have been~~ are to be removed from the ~~2014~~<sup>new</sup>, ~~slimmed~~<sup>slimmed</sup>-down version of the Music National Curriculum (~~2014~~) except in relation to listening to music (Gov.UK, ~~undated~~<sup>n.d.</sup>~~b~~).

Formatted: Font: 12 pt, Not Superscript

Formatted: Font: 12 pt

The change in focus on technology and erosion of time for music within the wider curriculum are not ~~only~~ features of primary education only. The only statement about ICT for ~~11- to 14-14-year-year~~-olds in the ~~most recent~~<sup>new</sup> Music National Curriculum (2014) is that students “should use technology appropriately” (Gov.UK, ~~undated~~<sup>n.d.</sup>~~b~~). More worryingly, following the recent introduction of the new examination framework for students aged 11–16—the English Baccalaureate (~~EBA~~<sup>Aee</sup>), which excludes music<sup>15</sup>—fewer students are opting for the subject (Office for Standards in Education~~Ofsted~~, 2013) and some schools are completely dropping music from their post-14 curriculum (Forgan, 2013). Additionally, in a number of secondary schools local to me the subsequent impact is a reduction of time for music within the curriculum for ~~11-14 year-olds~~<sup>11- to 14-year-olds</sup> (Office for Standards in Education~~Ofsted~~, 2012, p. 38). As such, in many secondary schools today, music teachers’ energy is focused upon preserving the place of music in schools, a more urgent necessity than a consideration of music technology in the curriculum.

Formatted: Font: 12 pt

Formatted: Font: 12 pt, Highlight

Furthermore, lack of availability of computer hardware for whole class use in the lower secondary school music lessons with children aged 11–14 is still an issue (Gall, 2013). A recent government report noted that music technology “was inadequate or non-existent in ~~---~~ over a third of the secondary schools inspected” (Office for Standards in Education~~Ofsted~~, 2012, p. 6). Yet head teachers and school governors, who nowadays have full control of their budget, have evidently not responded with financial support to

help change the situation since, over the last decade, [the Office for Standards in Education](#) ~~Ofsted have~~ has constantly highlighted the same concerns (2004a, 2004b, 2009).

So what are teachers who are able to work with whole classes of 11- ~~to 14-14-year~~ year-olds doing with computer music technology? The answer is mainly using ~~these~~ it to support practical music-making. Over the last ~~ten~~ 10 years, loop-based music creation software has been a favorite of many teachers owing to ease of use (Cooper, 2007) and its potential to enable the creation of music in popular styles (Gall & Breeze, 2005). I have also seen students offered the chance to develop programmatic music using sequencing software, ~~such as~~ for example sequencing a walk around an art gallery, stimulated by Mussorgsky's "Pictures at an Exhibition" (Breeze, 2009). Another local teacher encourages his ~~11-11-year-year~~ 11-year-olds to create their own sounds, which are recorded into sequencing software and become a bank for pairs to use in designing their own soundscapes, ~~that~~ which are then discussed in relation to *musique concrète*. Composing music for an advertisement or creating music to accompany a film ~~is~~ are also ~~a~~ popular ~~activities~~ projects for students of this age (Gall [Lazarus, Tidmarsh, & Breeze et al.](#), 2009). However, in England, aside from projects that I have ~~heard~~ read about in journal articles ([Baxter, 2013](#); [Savage & Challis, 2001, 2002](#); Challis, 2007; [Savage, 2012](#); Savage & Butcher, 2007; [Savage & Challis, 2001, 2002](#) ~~Savage, 2012~~; [Baxter, 2013](#)), I have seen very limited use of technologies for creative activities with 11- ~~to 14-14-year-year~~ year-olds other than paired work at computer workstations using sequencing or sample-sequencing software. That this is a national issue is confirmed by the latest triennial government music report, ~~that~~ which suggests that technology should be better used "to promote

Formatted: Font: 12 pt, Not Superscript  
Subscript

creativity” (as well as to widen participation and make assessment more musical<sup>16</sup>)  
(Office for Standards in Education Ofsted, 2012, p. 8).

While~~st~~ the use of computers with ~~11-14-year-olds~~ 11- to 14-year-olds has not been widespread in English schools, other technologies have become more commonplace: at the turn of the century, the development of Musical Futures, a new pedagogical approach to musical teaching and learning in schools, has led to a wider use of electric guitars and drum kits/pads in the classroom. The primary aim of the approach is to enable students to take more ownership of their music-making and to engage with the contemporary music they invariably enjoy outside ~~of~~ school. In groups they are given a song on CD and a range of (preferably) rock instruments, and then, through self-directed learning, they produce their own version of the piece (Paul Hamlyn Foundation ~~PHF, undated~~ n.d.).<sup>17</sup> More recently, the Musical Futures approach has been extended to include music other than contemporary pop, and the website now indicates ways ~~in which~~ to integrate technology into projects.<sup>18</sup> One local school has fully embedded rock music practical work within the curriculum for 11- to 14-year-olds ~~11-14 year-olds~~ but in a different way: through the purchase of five ~~Jampods~~ JamPods, each of which has a central student mixer linked to up to six “rock” instruments, most often used with headphones, thus enabling the whole class to work in small groups, but in a “silent” classroom (Bristol Post, 2013). Despite the expense of the ~~JamPod~~ JamPod, heads of departments with whom I work are very keen to acquire at least one or two sets in order to offer opportunities for more students to engage in “band” work within classroom lessons.

Formatted: Font: 12 pt, Highlight

Formatted: Font: 12 pt, Highlight

Interestingly, over the last decade there have been many positive developments in the use of technology in music classrooms for students aged 15–18. In the 1990s, changes to the Edexcel A level syllabus (for 17- ~~to 18-18-year-year~~-olds), discussed above, also impacted ~~upon~~ the board's syllabus for the school music examination for 14- ~~to 16-16-year-year~~-olds (GCSE) and, by 2000, sequencers, multi-track recorders, samplers, and record decks (for DJ-ing) were permitted for composing and for solo and ensemble performing within both examination syllabi (Terry, 2007). This further impacted ~~upon~~ other examination boards, which followed suit with respect to both GCSE and A level syllabi, although no other copied the creation of a separate music technology A level. At some of the schools with whom I work, the music technology A level has become so popular that the traditional music syllabus is not offered. This accords with governmental findings on the popularity of the subject: in 2011, a third of entries for A level music courses were for music technology ([Office for Standards in Education Ofsted](#), 2012). Furthermore, during the early 2000s, alongside these traditional courses most commonly found in schools, a number of significant alternatives, more vocational in nature, have also emerged ~~such as :~~ [Business and Technology Education Council BTEC BTEC and Reek School](#) courses ([Pearson, 2017](#)), which enable technology to be included in a range of ways within work-related/contemporary music projects ([K. Evans, 2009b](#)).

These curriculum changes have been radical in offering opportunities for students with a broad range of musical skills/interests to engage in formal school examination courses. For years, ~~14-16-year-olds~~ [14- to 16-year-olds](#) have [been](#) keen to utilize music technologies for composing. Indeed, in 2004, a government monitoring project for music reported that ICT was used most “to be creative; with 57% of key stage 4 [14- ~~to 16-16-~~

Formatted: Font: 12 pt, Not Superscript  
Subscript



~~year-year-old~~ pupils using ICT frequently for this purpose” (Qualifications and Curriculum Authority~~QCA/ MCA~~ 2003/4, as cited in Mellor, 2008, p. 452) and in 2005 the Edexcel GCSE examination board’s annual report on composing stated: “~~t~~hose [students] writing pieces that featured technology heavily, such as electronic music and club dance remix, often deserved full marks” (Edexcel, 2005, p. 14).<sup>19</sup> However, recently staff from the 20 school music departments with whom I am currently partnered for teacher education work expressed concern that they have never been able to support students in offering DJ-ing as a performance option because no one in the department has knowledge/skills in this area.

Formatted: Font: 12 pt, Highlight

## Technology in Schools in Other European Countries, 2008–2011

Thus far, the focus of this chapter has been on classroom work in England. However, as part of my work within the European Association for Music in Schools (~~EAS~~), I have engaged in research on the use of music technology in schools across Europe. In the first project in 2008, music educationists from 24 countries completed questionnaires on attitudes to ward, and uses of, music technology in schools in their countries~~y~~ (Sammer, Gall, & Breeze ~~et al.~~, 2009).<sup>20</sup> In the second, authors from 14 European countries each contributed a chapter to a volume in which they reflected upon a wide range of issues related to ICT and music from their ~~country’s~~ countries’ perspectives (Gall ~~et al.~~, Sammer, & de Vugt, 2012).<sup>21</sup> In this next section, I will draw upon these two publications to discuss similarities and differences across countries, including England.

Formatted: Font: 12 pt, Highlight

Formatted: Font: 12 pt, Highlight

(For ease of reading, I will note the author’s name when first introduced, and, thereafter, only the country.)

Formatted: Indent: First line: 1.27 c

In all countries the significance of the Internet was apparent, with some noting its use as “a complementary textbook and teaching aid” (Sweden: Scheid & Stranberg, 2012, p. 245; ~~also~~, Norway: Grønsdal, 2012), accessible at home as well as in school (Poland: Konkol & Kierzkowski, 2012). Some countries even relied solely on online curricula, which were seen to enable more student autonomy (Belgium: de Baets & Meyer, 2012; ~~the~~ Netherlands: Arnold, Overmars, & van de Putte, 2012). The Internet was also viewed as a quick means of obtaining a wide range of music for teaching purposes, particularly through the use of YouTube, in which listeners’ experience is enhanced by visual stimulation (Poland: Sammer, Gall, & Breeze, 2009; Cyprus: Savvidou, 2012) and a place for uploading students’ music for display purposes (Sweden: Scheid & Stranberg, 2012). From the chapter writings it would seem that access to these resources using mobile devices is only common practice in Sweden (~~ibid.~~, 2012~~ibid.~~). Recording technologies were cited as a means of capturing student performances (Germany: Sammer, Gall, & Breeze, ~~Ahlers~~, 2009; Belgium: de Baets & Meyer, 2012), mainly for the purpose of self-evaluation (Cyprus: Savvidou, 2012; ~~& and~~ Poland: Konkol & Kierzkowski, 2012). Interestingly, the most recent English governmental report on music in schools 2008–2011 expressed concern that there was under-use of the free online platform NuMu to share and appraise students’ composing and performing work, and insufficient use of audio recording by teachers as a means of assessing and aiding the improvement of students’ work (Office for Standards in Education~~Ofsted~~, 2012).

Another suggested use of technology was to support the development of what I have previously termed “traditional skills,” including: ear training (Poland & Switzerland: Sammer, Gall, & Breeze, 2009; Cyprus: Savvidou, 2012; Italy: Biasutti,

Formatted: Not Superscript/ Subscript

Formatted: Not Superscript/ Subscript

Formatted: Font: 12 pt, Not Superscript Subscript

Formatted: Font: 12 pt, Not Superscript Subscript

Formatted: Font: 12 pt, Not Superscript

Formatted: Font: 12 pt, Not Superscript Subscript

2012); musical listening and appreciation (Estonia & Slovenia: [Sammer, Gall, & Breeze, 2009](#); Belgium: [de Baets & Meyer, 2012](#)); analysis (Lithuania: Jautakyte, 2012); information retrieval from the Internet (Estonia: [Sammer, Gall, & Breeze, 2009](#); Austria: Höfer & Reubenz, 2012; Italy: [Biasutti, 2012](#)) especially in relation to the history of music (Slovakia: [Sammer, Gall, & Breeze, 2009](#); Norway: [Grønsdal, 2012](#)); notation (Germany & Poland: [Sammer, Gall, & Breeze, 2009](#)); and score writing skills (Cyprus: [Savvidou, 2012](#); Italy: [Biasutti, 2012](#)). One of the most novel uses of technology to support musical learning was cited in relation to work in Finland, where video conferencing is used to support classroom and individual instrumental teaching within schools situated in remote areas of the country ([Finland: Myllykoski, 2012](#)).

As might be expected, in every country the use of technology in relation to the development of musical skills was seen to vary according to the perceived significance of each skill within the cultural context. For example, technology supports vocal work in Slovakia and dance in Poland ([Sammer, Gall, & Breeze, 2009](#)); and is used in relation to performing popular music in Sweden ([Scheid & Stranberg, 2012](#)). Indeed, music educationists from three countries expressed their unease that technology could undermine the “core” classroom activities of singing and group music-making (Estonia, Slovakia, & Slovenia: [Sammer, Gall, & Breeze, 2009](#)).

In both publications the focus on composing that exists in England was not apparent in many countries, despite the fact that, within the research by Sammer, [Sammer, Gall, & Breeze et al.](#) (2009), composing and arranging were cited most often as skills developed through using technology. Data from almost all countries suggested that, as in England, the chief inhibitors to creative work in the classroom in the period 2008–2011

were the shortage of computer hardware, especially for use by non-examination (larger) classes, and the lack of training for teachers to feel confident and competent in supporting learning with technology in the classroom.

## And the Future? 2014 Onwards

While a number of the points that I raise in this final section may also relate to ICT and music in schools across Europe, I now return to some over-arching thoughts about music technology in formal education in England and my concerns about the future. It feels as if music technology in schools has been caught up in a vicious cycle: inadequate pre- and in-service training has resulted in many school music teachers lacking confidence or competence and, as a consequence, interest in ICT and music; a shortage of equipment for whole class use has then led to further hesitation in bringing technology into music lessons and a disinclination to develop new skills and awareness in this area of classroom work, especially with children under the age of 15, that is, in non-examination classes. The result is that many teachers remain unskilled and under-confident (Gall, 2013).

Sadly, music's low status position within the curriculum (Forgan, 2013) means that we are unlikely to see more money being allocated to music departments for new technological devices, despite the government's awareness of the likely impact: "music technology is changing rapidly and the schools found it difficult to develop their own resources in line with the quality of equipment which students were seeing—and sometimes using themselves—outside school. Consequently, ICT in school could appear dated to them." (Office for Standards in Education Ofsted, 2009, p. 34). This should be a matter of concern for all music educationists in a country ~~in which~~ where

student disengagement in school music has been recognized for years (Lamont, 2002; [Office for Standards in Education Ofsted](#), 2013).

Paradoxically, sophisticated mobile phones, which enable a range of multi-media activities, are invariably in great supply within most English classrooms since many young people own them. Yet, ~~whilst~~ while certain teachers have exploited these in school music lessons (Baxter, 2007), this is rare, since most schools' policies completely forbid mobile usage within lessons (Stowell & Dixon, 2014). Furthermore, although many students own or have access to iPads at home, in many secondary schools with which I work there is not even a central supply, let alone a set accessible for regular music classroom work. The availability of such a resource would overcome a key problem that pertains only to music and ICT: the typical lack of space to enable work with acoustic instruments (or drum kits ~~and~~ and electric guitars, which ~~that~~ are often housed in annexed practice rooms) at the same time as with computers ~~and/or~~ and/or other technologies (Gall, 2013). Furthermore, one of the government's key foci for more effective use of music technology in schools is "as a tool for inclusion" ([Office for Standards in Education Ofsted](#), 2012, p. 42); iPads nowadays not only offer a wide range of musical programs and software, but also act as an easily accessed sound palette for exploration by students, including those with severe physical disabilities (DM Drake Music, ~~undated~~ n.d.).

Effective use of ICT to support musical learning is not, however, merely an issue of equipment availability and/or teacher expertise. The above discussion has touched upon the significance of students' use of technology outside school. It is axiomatic that extra-curricular work in music is important in skills development, yet, as I have discussed

earlier in relation to pop music in schools in the 1970s, children's musical activities ~~outside of~~ formal education often not only differ from those in school classrooms but are at odds with them. Firstly, in children's lives outside school, work on one task often includes engagement with a variety of modes of learning, involving multi-tasking "hands-on" approaches with, often times, rapid movement between different modes and tools; this is at odds with the more linear learning traditionally experienced and expected in school. Secondly, staff interested in considering new approaches to student learning more in sympathy with children's out-of-school practices may be hindered by examination requirements ~~which that~~ not only tend to be conservative in nature, but, in the main, focus upon the achievements of the individual; this is inconsistent with the networking, sharing, and co-construction of knowledge that typify not only children's engagement with technology in their own time but also professional practice in music and the arts (Sexton, 2007). Moreover, outside school, children often experience music within multi-media settings (Pfeil et al., 2008), yet most English secondary schools organize learning in relation to separate "subjects." Therefore, at a time when the latest new English National Curriculum (2014) (Gov.UK, ~~undated~~ n.d.a) makes no mention of media or multi-media contexts and "English schools are hounded by league tables of exam results" (K. Smith, 2004a, p. 90), music activities within authentic multi-media settings and other classroom music innovations are less likely to be seen than established practice that teachers feel confident will support the attainment of high grades.

In light of the above discussion, it is ironic that recent governmental reports have remarked that "best practice" regarding technology in music classrooms occurs when teachers relate students' work to how ICT is used in the real world so that students can

Formatted: Font: 12 pt

Formatted: Font: 12 pt

explore processes used professionally ([Office for Standards in Education Ofsted](#), 2009). Many of the underlying structures and policies that underpin formal education in the ~~21st~~ twenty-first century are the chief inhibitors to these “real world” practices. If there is a true concern to help teachers overcome the problems of inadequate or ineffective use of ICT and music in classrooms noted regularly in school inspection reports ([Office for Standards in Education Ofsted](#), ~~2002~~, 2004a, 2004b, 2009, 2012), a major shift in school culture and established practice will be required. This is unlikely at a time when the place of music in schools ~~it is~~ is itself in question. However, it is my personal hope that the popularity of music technology as a school examination subject, the huge rise in numbers of students taking music technology-related undergraduate courses (Boehm, 2007), and the importance of the music business—much of which revolves around technology—as a chief revenue provider for the United Kingdom (Anderton, Dubber, & James~~et al.~~, 2013) might leverage educators’ attempts to retain music’s place within the secondary school curriculum.

## References

- Ahlers, M. (2012). Information communication technology as creativity support tools? On German music education’s history in ICT. In M. Gall, G. Sammer and A. de Vugt (Eds.) *European Perspectives on Music Education: New Media in the Classroom*. M. Gall, G. Sammer, & A. de Vugt (Eds.), *European perspectives on music education: New media in the classroom* (pp. 125–134). Innsbruck: Helbling Verlagsgesellschaft mbH, 125–134.
- Anderton, C., Dubber, A., & James, M. (2013). *Understanding the music industries*. London/California: Sage.

Formatted: Font: 12 pt, Italic

Arnold, J., Overmars, J., & van de Putte, R. (2012). ICT and teaching music in schools in Netherlands: The intro-model education. In M. Gall, G. Sammer, & A. de Vugt (Eds.), *European perspectives on music education: New media in the classroom* (pp. 163–176). Innsbruck: Helbling, 163–176.

[Baxter, A. \(2007\). The Mobile Phone and Class Music: A Teacher's Perspective. In J. Finney & P. Burnard \(Eds.\), \*Music Education with Digital Technology\* \(pp. 52–62\). London/New York: Continuum.](#)

Formatted: Not Highlight

Formatted: Normal, Line spacing: Double

Baxter, A. (2013). Playstation power: Removing performance barriers to musical composition. In J. Finney & F. Laurence (Eds.), *MasterClass in music education: Transforming teaching and learning* (pp. 173–181). London/New York: Bloomsbury, 173–181.

Bentley, A. (1969). Measurement and development of musical abilities: Some research interests and findings. *Journal of Research in Music Education*, 17(1), 41–46.

Biasutti, M. (2012). ICT in music education in Italy: Contexts, potentialities and perspectives. In M. Gall, G. Sammer, and A. de Vugt (Eds.), *European perspectives on music education: New media in the classroom* (pp. 135–147). Innsbruck: Helbling, 135–147.

Bloustein, G., Peters, M., & Luckman, S. (2008). 'Be not afeard; the isle is full of noises': Reflections on the synergies of music in the creative knowledge economy. In G. Bloustein, M. Peters, and S. Luckman (Eds.), *Sonic synergies: Music, technology, community, identity* (pp. xxi–xxviii). Aldershot, UK/Burlington, USA: Ashgate Publishing, xxi–xxviii.



Boehm, C. (2007). The discipline that never was: Current developments in music technology in higher education in Britain. *Journal of Music Technology and Education*, 1(1), 7–21.

Breeze, N. (2009). Learning design and proscriptioin: How generative activity was promoted in music composing. *International Journal of Music Education*, 27(3), 204–219.

*Bristol Post*. (2013, January 21). Kick out the jams! Student rock out with music system. *Bristol Post*, 21 January 2013. Also available online at Retrieved January 31, 2017 February 21, 2014, from <http://www.bristolpost.co.uk/Kick-jams-Students-rock-music/story-17919091-detail/story.html> (accessed 21 February 2014).

Formatted: Font: 12 pt, Italic

Carden-Price, C., Philpott, S., & Lewis, M. (2002). Public examinations 2: A Level and Post-16 examinations. In C. Philpott (Ed.), *Learning to teach music in the secondary school: A companion to school experience* (pp. 201–221). London/New York: RoutledgeFalmer, 201–221.

Cayari, C. (2011). The YouTube effect: How YouTube has provided new ways to consume, create, and share music. *International Journal of Education & the Arts*, 12(6).

Challis, M. (2007). The DJ factor: Teaching performance and composition from back to front. In J. Finney & P. Burnard (Eds.), *Music education with digital technology* (pp. 65–75). London/New York: Continuum, 65–75.

Christenson, P. G., DeBenedittis, P., & Lindlof, T. R. (1985). Children's use of audio media. *Communication Research*, 12(3), 327–343.

- Cook, C. (2010). Entertainment in a box: Domestic design and the radiogram and television, music in art. *Rethinking Music in Art: New Directions in Music Iconography*, 35(1/2), 261–270.
- Cook, N. (1998). *Analysing musical multimedia*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Cooper, L. (2007). The gender factor: Teaching composition in music technology to boys and girls in year 9. In J. Finney & P. Burnard (Eds.), *Music education with digital technology* (pp. 30–41). London/New York: Continuum, 30–41.
- Cox, G. (1996). School music broadcasts and the BBC 1924–47. *History of Education: Journal of the History of Education Society*, 25(4), 363–371.
- de Baets, T., & Meyer, H. (2012). Embedding ICT in music education: A Belgian perspective. In M. Gall, G. Sammer, and A. de Vugt (Eds.), *European perspectives on music education: New media in the classroom* (pp. 45–54). Innsbruck: Helbling, 45–54.
- Department for Education and Employment ~~(DfEE)~~ Qualifications and Curriculum Authority ~~(QCA)~~ (1999). *Music: The National Curriculum for England*. London: HMSO.
- Department of Education and Science ~~(DES)~~ (1991). *National Curriculum: Music working group interim report*. London: DES.
- Dickinson, K. (Ed.). (2003). *Movie music: The film reader*. London/New York: Routledge.
- DM Drake Music. ~~(undated n.d.)~~. *Using iPads for the first time in a SEN school*. Available online at: [Retrieved January 31, 2017](#)

~~February 26, 2014, from~~ <http://www.drakemusic.org/dm-education/experiences/using-ipads-first-time-sen-school> ~~(accessed 26 February 2014).~~

Dolge, A. (1972). *Pianos and their makers: A comprehensive history of the development of the piano*. New York: Dover.

Edexcel. (2005). *GCSE Examiner's Report: Music (1426)*. Mansfield: Edexcel.

Evans, J. (2009~~a~~). Continuing pupils' experiences of singing and instrumental learning from Key Stage 2 to Key Stage 3. In J. Evans ~~and~~ & C. Philpott ~~(Eds.)~~ (Eds.), *A practical guide to teaching music in the secondary school* (pp. 74–81). London/New York: Routledge, ~~74–81~~.

Evans, K. (2009~~b~~). Musical teaching and learning in 14–19 education. In J. Evans ~~&~~ and C. Philpott ~~(Eds.)~~ (Eds.), *A practical guide to teaching music in the secondary school* (pp. 17–26). London/New York: Routledge, ~~17–26~~.

Fitzgerald, M., Joseph, A., Hayes, M., & O'Regan, M. (1995). Leisure activities of adolescent schoolchildren. *Journal of Adolescence*, 18(3), 349–358.

Forgan, L. (2013, ~~January 13~~). Arts Council chief accuses Gove of abandoning cultural education. *The Guardian*, ~~13 January 2013~~. Retrieved January 31, 2017~~20~~, 2013, from Available online at: <http://www.guardian.co.uk/culture/2013/jan/15/arts-council-chief-gove-education> ~~(accessed 20 January 2013).~~

Gall, M. (2013). Trainee teachers' perceptions: Factors that constrain the use of music technology in teaching placements. *Journal of Music, Technology & Education*, 6(1), 5–27.

Gall, M., & Breeze, N. (2005). Music composition lessons: The multimodal affordances of technology. *Educational Review*, 57(4), 415–433.

Gall, M., Lazarus, E., Tidmarsh, C., & Breeze, N. (2009). Creative designs for learning. In R. Sutherland, S. Robertson, and P. John (Eds.), *Improving classroom learning with ICT* (pp. 88–114). London: Routledge.

Gall, M., Sammer, G., & de Vugt, A. (Eds.). (2012). *European perspectives on music education: New media in the classroom*. Innsbruck: Helbling-Verlagsgesellschaft mbH.

Giles, A. (n.d.). *Whirligig Snippets*. Retrieved January 28, 2017, from <http://www.whirligig-tv.co.uk/tv/memories/snippets/snippets7.htm>

Gov.UK. (n.d.). *Collection: National Curriculum*. Retrieved January 31, 2017, from <https://www.gov.uk/government/collections/national-curriculum> (accessed 14 February 2014).

Gov.UK (n.d.). *National Curriculum in England: Music programmes of study*. Retrieved January 31, 2017, from <https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/national-curriculum-in-england-music-programmes-of-study>

Giles, A. (n.d.). *Whirligig Snippets*. Retrieved January 28, 2017, from <http://www.whirligig-tv.co.uk/tv/memories/snippets/snippets7.htm>

Grønsdal, I. (2012). ICT in music education in Norwegian secondary schools. In M. Gall, G. Sammer, and A. de Vugt (Eds.), *European perspectives on music*

Formatted: Not Highlight

Formatted: Font: Italic, Not Highlight

Formatted: Not Highlight

Formatted: REF, Indent: First line: 1

Formatted: Font: 12 pt

Formatted: Font: 12 pt, Italic

Formatted: Not Highlight

Formatted: Font: 12 pt

Formatted: Not Highlight

Formatted: Font: 12 pt

Formatted: Indent: Left: 0 cm, First line: 0 cm

Formatted: Font: (Default) Times New

Formatted: Font: 12 pt

Formatted: Font: (Default) Times New

Formatted: No underline, Font color: A

education: *New media in the classroom* (pp. 177–191). Innsbruck: Helbling Verlagsgesellschaft mbH, 177–191.

Hennessy, S. (2012). Improving primary teaching: Minding the gap. In G. McPherson and G. Welch (Eds.), *The Oxford handbook of music education*, (Volume Vol. 2, pp. 625–628). Oxford: Oxford University Press, 625–628.

Historical Boys' Clothing (2004). *English Schools Dance Program: Music and Movement*. Retrieved January 28, 2017, from <http://histclo.com/act/dance/les/cou/eng/sdle-mam.html>

Höfer, F. & Reubenz, J. (2012). New media in Austrian music teaching in school. In M. Gall, G. Sammer, and A. de Vugt (Eds.), *European perspectives on music education: New media in the classroom* (pp. 31–43). Innsbruck: Helbling Verlagsgesellschaft mbH, 31–43.

Jautakyte, Z. (2012). ICT in Music: A Case of Lithuanian upper school education. In M. Gall, G. Sammer, & A. de Vugt (Eds.), *European perspectives on music education: New media in the classroom* (pp. 149–162). Innsbruck: Helbling, 149–162.

Juniper, D. (2004). The First World War and radio development. *History Today*, 54(5), 32–38.

Kaplan, E. A. (1987). *Rocking around the clock: Music television, postmodernism and consumer culture*. London: Methuen.

Katz, M. (2004). *Capturing sound: How technology has changed music*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Formatted: Font: (Default) Times New Roman, 12 pt, No underline

Formatted: N

Formatted: Font: (Default) Times New Roman, 12 pt, Italic, No underline

Formatted: Font: (Default) Times New Roman, 12 pt, No underline

Formatted: No underline, Font color: A

Konkol, G.\_K. & Kierzkowski, M. (2012). ICT in music teaching in the context of a new education system in Poland. In M. Gall, G. Sammer, and A. de Vugt (Eds.), *European perspectives on music education: New media in the classroom* (pp. 193–204). Innsbruck: Helbling Verlagsgesellschaft mbH, 193–204.

Leask, M. (2002). The new opportunities fund: Training for teachers and school librarians in the use of ICT. London: Teacher Training Agency.

~~Lenhart, A., Purcell, K., Smith, A. & Zickuhr, K. (2010) *Social media and mobile internet use among teens and young adults*. Washington DC: Pew Internet and American Life Project.~~

Lamont, A. (2002). Musical identities and the school environment. In R. A. R. MacDonald, D. J. Hargreaves, and D. E. Meill (Eds.), *Musical identities* (pp. 41–59). Oxford: Oxford University Press, 41–59.

Larson, R., Kubey, R., & Colletti, J. (1989). Changing channels: Early adolescent media choices and shifting investments in families and friends, *Journal of Youth and Adolescents*, 18(6), 583–599.

~~Lenhart, A., Purcell, K., Smith, A., & Zickuhr, K. (2010). *Social media and mobile internet use among teens and young adults*. Washington, DC: Pew Internet and American Life Project.~~

Majeski, B.\_T. (1990). *A history of the US music industry*. Englewood, NJ: ~~The~~ Music Trades.

McSwain, R. (1995). The power of the electric guitar, *Popular Music and Society*, 19(4), 21–40.

- Mellor, L. (2008). Creativity, originality, identity: Investigating computer-based composition in the secondary school. *Music Education Research*, 10(4), 451–472.
- Mundy, J. (1999). *Popular music on screen: From Hollywood musical to music video*. Manchester: Manchester University Press.
- Myllykoski, M. (2012). The use of ICT and music technology in Finnish music education. In ~~Gall, M. Gall, Sammer, G. Sammer, and de Vugt, A. de Vugt~~ (Eds.), *European perspectives on music education: New media in the classroom* (pp. 115–124). Innsbruck: Helbling, 115–124.
- National Music Council. ~~(NMC)~~ (1999). *A sound performance: The economic value of music to the United Kingdom*. London: NMC/KPMG.
- Odam, G. (2000). Teaching composing in the secondary school: The creative dream. *British Journal of Music Education*, 17(2), 109–127.
- Office for Standards in Education ~~(Ofsted)~~ (2004a). *2004 report: ICT in schools—the impact of government initiatives: Secondary music (HMI 2189)*. Manchester: Ofsted.
- Office for Standards in Education ~~(Ofsted)~~ (2004b). *Ofsted subject reports 2002/3: Music education in secondary schools (HMI 1981)*. Manchester: Ofsted.
- Office for Standards in Education. ~~(Ofsted)~~ (2009). *Making more of music: An evaluation of music in schools 2005–08. (HMI 080235)*. London: Ofsted.
- Office for Standards in Education ~~(Ofsted)~~ (2012). *Music in schools: Wider still, and wider*. Retrieved January 31, 2017

~~February 26, 2014, from Available online at: <http://www.ofsted.gov.uk/resources/music-schools-wider-still-and-wider> (accessed 26 February 2014).~~

Office for Standards in Education (~~Ofsted~~). (2013). *Music in schools: What hubs must do (Ref 130231)*. Retrieved January 31, 2017

~~February 24, 2014, from Available online at: <http://www.ofsted.gov.uk/resources/music-schools-what-hubs-must-do> (accessed 24 February 2014).~~

Paul Hamlyn Foundation. (~~PHF~~) (~~undated~~ n.d.). *Music futures: Resources*. Retrieved January 31, 2017

~~February 21, 2014, from Available online at: <https://www.musicalfutures.org/Resources> (accessed 21 February 2014).~~

Pearson (2017). *Qualifications. Music: Overview*. Retrieved 31 January 31, 2017, from <https://qualifications.pearson.com/en/subjects/music.html>

Pfeil, U., Arjan, R., & Zaphiris, P. (2008). Age differences in online social networking—A study of user profiles and the social capital divide among teenagers and older users in MySpace. *Computers in Human Behaviour*, 5(3), 643–654.

Philpott, C. & Carden-Price, C. (2001). Public examinations 1: the General Certificate of secondary Education (GCSE) in music. In C. Philpott (Ed.) *Learning to Teach Music in the Secondary School* (pp.177-200). London/New York: RoutledgeFalmer.

Raacke, J., & Bonds-Raacke, J. (2008). MySpace and Facebook: Applying the uses and gratifications theory to exploring friend-networking sites. *Cyberpsychology & Behavior*, 11(2), 169–174.

Formatted: Line spacing: 1.5 lines

Formatted: Indent: First line: 1.27 c  
Line spacing: 1.5 lines

Field Code Changed

Formatted: Comment Text

Formatted: No underline, Font color: A

Formatted: Font: Not Italic, No  
underline, Font color: Auto

Formatted: No underline, Font color: A



- Richard, B., & Kruger, H.H. (2005). Ravers' paradise: German youth cultures in the 1990s. In T. Skelton & G. Valentine (Eds.), *Cool places: Geographies of youth culture* (pp. 162–175). London: Routledge, 162–175.
- Risset, J-C. (2004). The liberation of sound, art-science and the digital domain: Contacts with Edgard Varèse, *Contemporary Music Review*, 23(2), 27–54.
- Russcol, H. (1972). *The liberation of sound*. London: Prentice Hall.
- Sachs, C. (2006). *The history of musical instruments*. New York: Dover.
- Salavuo, M. (2006). Open and informal online communities as forums of collaborative musical activities and learning. *British Journal of Music Education*, 23(3), 253–271.
- Sammer, G., Gall, M., & Breeze, N. (2009). Using music software at school: The European framework. In G. Fiocchetta and F. Ballanti (Eds.), *NET Music Project 01: New education technology in music field* (pp. 155–177). Rome: Anicia srl, 155–177.
- Sachs, C. (2006) *The history of musical instruments*. New York: Dover.
- Salavuo, M. (2006) Open and informal online communities as forums of collaborative musical activities and learning. *British Journal of Music Education*, 23(3), 253–271.
- Savage, J. (2012). Moving beyond subject boundaries: Four case studies of cross-curricular pedagogy in secondary schools, *International Journal of Educational Research*, 55, 79–88.
- Savage, J., & Butcher, J. (2007). DubDubDub: Improvisation using the sounds of the Worldwide Web, *Journal of Music, Education and Technology*, 1(1), 83–96.

- Savage, J., & Challis, M. (2001). Dunwich revisited: Collaborative composition and performance with new technologies. *British Journal of Music Education*, 18(2), 139–149.
- Savage, J., & Challis, M. (2002). A digital arts curriculum? Practical ways forward. *Music Education Research*, 4(1), 7–23.
- Savvidou, D. (2012). The use of ICT in music education: The Cypriot perspective. In M. Gall, G. Sammer, and A. de Vugt (Eds.), *European perspectives on music education: New media in the classroom* (pp. 55–76). Innsbruck: Helbling, 55–76.
- Scheid, M., & Stranberg, T. (2012). Schools' permeable walls and media cultures: An example of new prerequisites for music education in Sweden. In M. Gall, G. Sammer, and A. de Vugt (Eds.), *European perspectives on music education: New media in the classroom* (pp. 237–251). Innsbruck: Helbling, 237–251.
- Schrader, B. (1982). *Introduction to electro-acoustic music*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.
- Sergeant, D., & Boyle, J. D. (1980). Contextual influences on pitch judgement. *Psychology of Music*, 8(2), 3–15.
- Sexton, J. (Ed.). (2007) *Music sound and multi-media: From the live to the virtual*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.
- Smith, J. (2004). I can see tomorrow in your face: A study of “Dance Dance Revolution” and music video games. *Journal of Popular Music Studies*, 16(1), 58–64.

- Smith, K. (2004~~a~~). An investigation into the experience of first year students at British universities. *Arts and Humanities in Higher Education*, 3(1), 81–93.
- Spruce, G. (2002). Ways of thinking about music: Political dimensions and educational consequences. In G. Spruce (Ed.), *Teaching music in secondary schools: A reader* (pp. 3–24). London/New York: RoutledgeFalmer, 3–24.
- Stowell, D., & Dixon, D. (2014). Integration of informal music technologies in secondary school music lessons. *British Journal of Music Education*, 31(1), 19–39.
- Tattersall, K. (1994). The role and functions of public examinations, assessment in education. *Principles, Policy & Practice*, 1(3), 293–304.
- Terry, P. (2009). *GCSE music study guide* (3rd edn.). London: Routledge.
- Théberge, P. (1997). *Any sound you can imagine: Making music/consuming technology*. Middletown, CT: Wesleyan University Press.
- Tobias, E. (2012). Let's play: Learning music through video games and virtual worlds. In G. McPherson and G. Welch (Eds.), *The Oxford handbook of music education* (Volume Vol. 2, pp. 531–548). Oxford: Oxford University Press, 531–548.
- Vulliamy, G. (1976). Pupil-centred music teaching. In G. Vulliamy & E. Lee (Eds.), *Pop music in school* (pp. 49–61). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 49–61.
- Werner, A. (2009). Girls consuming music at home: Gender and the exchange of music through new media. *European Journal of Cultural Studies*, 12(3), 269–284.

Wright, P. (2002). ICT and the music curriculum. In G. Spruce (Ed.), *Teaching music in secondary schools: A reader* (pp. 143–165). London/New York:

RoutledgeFalmer, 143–165.

Zehnder, S. M., & Lipscomb, S. D. (2006). The role of music in video games. In P.

Vordererr and J. Bryant (Eds.), *Playing video games: Motives, responses, and consequences* (pp. 241–258). NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum, 241–258.

## Notes

<sup>1</sup> The epigraph is from Russcol (1972, p. 33).

## Endnotes

<sup>2</sup> Reports, made available to the public via a website, follow visits to schools, made with very short notice. Failure to gain either a Good or Outstanding grade leads to further visits; continuing low standards can result in the dismissal of school staff.

<sup>3</sup> Throughout I write “English,” although I call myself “British,” because the education systems and school music are not the same in all countries of the United Kingdom.

<sup>4</sup> See <AU: pls. provide author, title, and date of each item cited here or otherwise clarify what it is> <http://histelo.com/act/dance/les/cou/eng/sdle-mam.html> for more information on the broadcast, and <http://www.whirligig-tv.co.uk/tv/memories/snippets/snippets7.htm> for a sound recording of one of the programs. See Historical Boys' Clothing (2004) *English Schools Dance Program: Music and Movement* for more information on the broadcast and Giles, A. (n.d.) *Whirligig Snippets* for a sound recording of one of the programs. If you wish these changes should the following also be added to

Formatted: Font: 12 pt

Formatted: Font: 12 pt

Formatted: Font: 12 pt

Formatted: Font: 12 pt

Formatted: Font: 12 pt, Not Superscript/ Subscript

Formatted: Font: (Default) Times New Roman, 12 pt, Not Superscript/ Subscript

Formatted: Not Superscript/ Subscript

~~the Reference section as follows (I have added them above):~~

~~Giles, A. (n.d.) Whirligig Snippets. Retrieved January 28, 2017, from <http://www.whirligig-tv.co.uk/tv/memories/snippets/snippets7.htm>~~

~~Historical Boys' Clothing (2004) English Schools Dance Program: Music and Movement. Retrieved January 28, 2017, from <http://histelo.com/act/dance/les/eou/eng/sdle-mam.html>~~

Formatted: Font: 12 pt, No underline, Font color: Auto

Formatted: No underline

Formatted: Font: 12 pt, No underline, Font color: Auto

Formatted: Font: 12 pt

<sup>5</sup> The other was singing British folk songs.

<sup>6</sup> Practical activities happened “outside” ~~of the course,~~ and it was only during my time at the university that composition was introduced as a possible area of study.

Formatted: Font: 12 pt

<sup>7</sup> ~~Called For the~~ Certificate of Secondary Education (~~CSE~~) Mode 3.

Formatted: Font: 12 pt

<sup>8</sup> At this time, a typical lesson for students aged 11–14 focused on performing or composing tasks, with students working in groups of ~~3–6~~<sup>three to six</sup> using music keyboards and/or voices and/or acoustic (including Orff) instruments.

Formatted: Font: 12 pt

<sup>9</sup> This continues to date.

Formatted: Font: 12 pt

<sup>10</sup> The National Music Council (~~NMC~~) reported that, in the United Kingdom in 1997, more money was spent on keyboards than on any other instrument (National Music Council~~NMC~~, 1999).

Formatted: Font: 12 pt

<sup>11</sup> Schools choose from three ~~government government-~~regulated, examination boards

Formatted: Font: 12 pt

(~~<AU: pls. spell out ACA and OCR>~~AQA, Edexcel, and OCR ~~AQA is~~

Formatted: Font: 12 pt, Not Superscript

~~Assessment and Qualifications Alliance but no-one in the UK will know this as it's never referred to as anything else than AQA.~~

Formatted: Not Superscript/ Subscript

~~The same applies to OCR which stands for Oxford, Cambridge and Royal Society of Arts. (I didn't know either of these myself!) So I suggest you leave AQA and OCR.)~~, who set their own syllabi and

Formatted: Font: 12 pt, Not Superscript Subscript

examinations; the requirements of these vary, but in each there is the same focus upon active music-making that is found within the National Curriculum for younger pupils.

<sup>12</sup> At the same time, computer music notation software was being used by students on the traditional A level Music course, who were required to submit a score of their compositions.

<sup>13</sup> Boehm (2007, p.10<AU: p. no. of quot.??>) notes that, in 2007, there were 351 in the category of music technology (although only 131 included “music technology” in the title)2007.

<sup>14</sup> Most schools created centralized computer suites which that were primarily used by teachers of subjects other than the arts, partly because they did not include the associated equipment, such as high-high-quality sound-cards and music (MIDI) keyboards.

<sup>15</sup> Students must achieve in mathematics, English, the sciences, a language, and history or geography.

<sup>16</sup> By: significantly improving the use of music technology to record, store, listen to and assess pupils’ work; placing greater emphasis on pupils’ musical development through the use of technology – with the acquisition of technical skills and knowledge supporting, rather than driving, musical learning [and] making more creative and effective use of music technology to support performing and listening work (Ofsted 2012, p.8).

<sup>17</sup> This methodology is now widely known in England. It is difficult to know how widespread its use is, although many teachers (including those from countries outside England) network within their website, and a number of the teachers with whom I work include one or two Musical Futures projects within their curriculum for 11– to 14-year-olds.

Formatted: Font: 12 pt

Formatted: Font: 12 pt

Formatted: Font: 12 pt, Not Superscript Subscript

Formatted: Font: 12 pt

Formatted: Font: 12 pt

Formatted: Endnote Text

Formatted: English (United Kingdom)

Formatted: Font: 12 pt

---

<sup>18</sup> See [Paul Hamlyn Foundation PHF](#) ([undatedn.d.](#)) for a range of resources.

Formatted: Font: 12 pt, Highlight

<sup>19</sup> This was in relation to one assessment criterion: “use of technology”; grades were also allocated to a number of other criteria for each piece.

Formatted: Font: 12 pt, Highlight

<sup>20</sup> Austria, Belgium, Croatia, [the](#) Czech Republic, Denmark, England, Estonia, Finland, France, Germany, Greece, Hungary, Iceland, Ireland, Italy, Kosovo, Norway, Portugal, Scotland, Slovenia, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland, and the Netherlands.

Formatted: Font: 12 pt, Highlight

<sup>21</sup> Austria, Belgium, Cyprus, England, Finland, Germany, Italy, Lithuania, Norway, Poland, Slovenia, Spain, Sweden, and the Netherlands.

Formatted: Font: 12 pt, Highlight